UNITED
NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2915
29 March 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND
NINE HUNDRED AND FIFTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 March 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Democratic Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. HAGOSS
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. WILKINSON
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60360/A 7139V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 11 a.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION IN THE OCCUPIED ARAB TERRITORIES

LETTER DATED 12 FEBRUARY 1990 FROM THE PERMANENT REPRESENTATIVE OF THE UNION OF SOVIET SOCIALIST REPUBLICS TO THE UNITED NATIONS ADDRESSED TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SECURITY COUNCIL (S/21139)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): In accordance with the decisions taken at the previous meetings on this item, I invite the representatives of Algeria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Egypt, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Israel, Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Morocco, Pakistan, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, the Syrian Arab Republic, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the United Republic of Tanzania, Yemen and Yugoslavia to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber. I invite the representative of Palestine to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Bendjama (Algeria), Mr. Al-Shakar (Bahrain), Mr. Chowdhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moussa (Egypt), Mr. Menon (India), Mr. Sutresna (Indonesia), Mr. Al-Anbari (Iraq), Mr. Bein (Israel), Mr. Salah (Jordan), Mr. Treiki (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Rahhali (Morocco), Mr. Umer (Pakistan), Mr. Al-Nasser (Qatar), Mr. Al-Kahtany (Saudi Arabia), Mrs. Diallo (Senegal), Mr. Awad (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Ghezal (Tunisia), Mr. Oudovenko (Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic), Mr. Nyakyi (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Sallam (Yemen) and Mr. Pejic (Yugoslavia) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber; Mr. Al-Kidwa (Palestine) took a place at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform the Council that I have received letters from the representatives of Afghanistan, the Islamic Republic of Iran, Kuwait and Nicaragua in which they request to be invited

(The President)

to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Noor (Afghanistan), Mr. Kharrazi (Islamic Republic of Iran), Mr. Abulhasan (Kuwait) and Mr. Vigil (Nicaragua) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council Chamber.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now resume its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Mr. FORTIER (Canada) (interpretation from French): May I first of all congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month of March - a particularly busy month. I take this opportunity also to thank Ambassador Alarcon of Cuba for the exemplary service he rendered the Council during the Cuban term of office as President, in February.

At this advanced stage of our debate, and having had the advantage of hearing the views expressed by many speakers on this complex and ever-changing question, we shall confine ourselves to some brief observations.

In our opinion, this question combines three principles long established in international law and in Canada's foreign policy.

The first of these principles amounts to the following. Canada unequivocally supports the right of any individual to leave any country, including his own. This right is enshrined in article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and in article 12 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. For more than 15 years now, the Government of Canada has been encouraging the Soviet Union, among others, to liberalize its emigration policies. In this respect,

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Canada has welcomed with great satisfaction the new political climate and the democratization that have been in evidence in the Soviet Union and that have brought with them radical changes in the emigration laws in that country. These changes have made it possible for Soviet citizens, and especially Soviet Jews, to emigrate more freely. Furthermore, Canada has taken very favourable note of the measures adopted so far by the Soviet Government to counter the anti-Semitism that has unfortunately been shown by some organizations in that country. None the less, if, as reliable indicators seem to predict, the pace of emigration were to be stepped up, then many Soviet Jews would be likely to move to Israel and to other countries in the coming years.

Canada, as a contracting party to the Fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, has always advocated respect for that Convention. In this context, and during previous debates on related issues in the Security Council, Canada has often stated its opinion that the Fourth Geneva Convention applies to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967. We have always urged Israel fully to respect all the provisions of the Convention, and in particular to apply them to the occupied territories. Article 49 of the Convention, which stipulates explicitly that the occupying Power shall not transfer parts of its civilian population into the territory it occupies, is particularly relevant to our debate.

There is another principle to which Canada has always subscribed. Since we do not recognize the permanence of the Israeli control over the territories occupied since 1967, we are against any unilateral measure taken by Israel in regard to these territories, above all any measures that could pre-determine the outcome of future peace negotiations. It goes without saying that such unilateral measures include the establishment of new settlements - populated either by long-standing Israeli residents or by recently arrived immigrants.

READEX

(Mr. Fortier, Canada)

Hence, given its adherence to the principles of international law to which I have referred, Canada has always opposed and will continue to oppose any measure taken by the Israeli Government with a view to modifying the demographic structure of the occupied territories, in particular in the coming months, when we shall witness the arrival of many Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union. We urge the Israeli Government to settle these immigrants exclusively within its borders established before 1967 and to prohibit the settling of other Israeli citizens in the occupied territories. Canada is of the opinion that any contrary behaviour by Israel would have a very negative impact on the delicate negotiations under way in the quest for a peaceful, fair, lasting and comprehensive settlement, which many of us have always wished for - and still wish for - and have actively encouraged in past years.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Canada for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. TORNUDD (Finland): We are approaching the end of the month, Sir, but my delegation has not yet had the opportunity in a public meeting to congratulate you on your country's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the current month. I should like to do so now, and to extend to you our very best wishes and our pledge of full co-operation with you in your important task.

I should like also to thank Ambassador Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba for his very efficient handling of the presidency during the month of February.

Like other speakers before us we have been struck by the fact that in the light of the settlement policy and practices of Israel in the territories occupied since 1967, recent immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel has raised wide-spread concern about the future of those territories, which in turn is connected with the future of any peace effort in the Middle East.

The legal and political issues related to the question of Israeli settlements in the occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, including Jerusalem, appear very clear. According to the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949, which is applicable to those territories, the occupying Power shall not deport or transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies.

The Security Council itself has previously determined that all measures to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the occupied territories, including the policy and practices of Israel in establishing settlements there, are not permissible and have no legal validity.

Regrettably, such settlements have nevertheless been established. No guarantees as to the future have been given. The existence of settlements, in contravention of the Geneva Convention and the relevant Security Council resolutions, has been one of the factors considerably complicating the peace process in the Middle East, thereby obstructing the achievement of a comprehensive,

(Mr. Tornudd, Finland)

just and lasting peace in the area. Under the current well-known circumstances in the occupied territories, the mere possibility of settling numbers of newcomers there is highly disturbing and makes progress in the peace process more difficult. For those reasons, Finland urges the Israeli authorities not to allow immigrants to settle in the territories occupied since 1967.

At the same time, however, I wish to emphasize that freedom of movement and the right to leave any country are basic human rights which should be respected by all. We therefore appreciate the opportunity given to Soviet Jews to leave their country in accordance with their own wishes.

In the present situation it would be vital for the Security Council to be able to adopt a resolution along earlier lines, calling upon Israel to dismantle the settlements and to cease the policy of allowing new settlers to move into the occupied territories, whether from abroad or from within its own boundaries. Against the background of recent developments, much emphasis has throughout our debate been put on the importance of moving towards a comprehensive settlement in the Middle East. Under current circumstances, it is indeed of extreme urgency to proceed with the peace process so as to achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement in the troubled Middle East.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Finland for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. BLANC (France) (interpretation from French): I wish first of all to congratulate you, Sir, on Democratic Yemen's assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. I take this opportunity also to thank His Excellency Mr. Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, the Permanent Representative of Cuba, who presided over our work in February.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The Government of France considers that the question now before the Council is of particular concern. France has always deplored Israel's settlement policy in the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem. Indeed, we view those settlements as illegal under international law. They alter the demographic structure of the occupied territories and thus violate the provisions of the fourth Geneva Convention, which we deem to be fully applicable to those territories. We call once again upon Israel to respect its obligations under that Convention, as it has been called upon to do on many occasions by the international community, and in particular by this Council.

It is in that spirit, and based upon the same obligations we consider incumbent upon Israel, that we define our position on the question before us today: the threat posed by the settlement in the occupied territories of Jews from the Soviet Union emigrating to Israel or already residing there. The proposals made in that connection a few weeks ago by Israeli officials, including the new call for increased Jewish settlement in the West Bank, Gaza and East Jerusalem, justify the concern expressed on this subject. Nor can such declarations create the climate of confidence that is essential for any progress towards a peaceful settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict.

I want to reaffirm that France welcomes the new Soviet emigration policy, notably the freedom to emigrate to Israel or elsewhere for Soviet Jews desiring to do so. The right of every individual to leave any country, including his own, and to return to it is enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. But we consider that the exercise of that right by Soviet Jews must not be to the detriment of the rights of Palestinians in the occupied territories. It would be unacceptable and unjust for the exercise by Soviet Jews of their new-found freedom to violate the rights of another people.

(Mr. Blanc, France)

The Israeli authorities must therefore not compromise the prospect of peace by allowing or encouraging the settlement in the Arab territories occupied since 1967 of Israeli immigrants or residents. They must put an end without delay to the settlement policy they have been pursuing in those territories.

The problem now before the Council highlights once again the urgent need to achieve, by peaceful means, a comprehensive, just and lasting settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict. Efforts undertaken to initiate an Israeli-Palestinian dialogue command our support as a first step towards such a settlement. Mutual recognition by Palestinians and Israelis of their respective rights and aspirations is the basis of a genuine lasting peace. The settlement to which we aspire must guarantee the right of Israel to exist within secure and recognized borders and the equally important right of the Palestinian people to a homeland in which, through the exercise of its self-determination, it can construct the structures of its choice.

An international peace conference, under United Nations auspices, dealing with all aspects of the conflict and with the participation of all parties concerned, is the most appropriate framework for direct negotiations among the parties.

For its part, France remains determined to spare no effort to promote progress in that direction.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of France for the kind words he addressed to me.

Mr. RICHARDSON (United Kingdom): May I first congratulate you warmly, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for this month and on the skill with which you have guided the Council's work. Our thanks also go to Ambassador Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba for his efficient handling of the Council's affairs in the month of February.

My Government has long made clear its condemnation of the practice of settling Israeli citizens in the occupied territories, including East Jerusalem. Such settlements are illegal under international law. They are, in particular, a flagrant violation of article 49 of the fourth Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which clearly states that an occupying Power shall not transfer parts of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies. The United Kingdom is in no doubt that that Convention aqpplies to the territories occupied by Israel since 1967, including East Jerusalem.

The practice of establishing illegal Israeli settlements in the occupied territories has been going on for nearly a quarter of a century. There are now over 65,000 Jewish settlers in the West bank, some 3,000 in the Gaza Strip and some 80,000 in East Jerusalem. A further 9,000 have settled in the Golan Heights. Israel has consistently ignored Security Council and General Assembly resolutions calling for an end to this settlement programme.

This problem is now being aggravated by the arrival of Soviet Jews in the occupied territories. Let there be no misunderstanding about my Government's views. My Government warmly welcomes the liberalization of Soviet emigration controls, including the freedom of Soviet Jews to emigrate to Israel and elsewhere. The right of everyone to leave any country, including his own, is enshrined in the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. But it would be ironic and unjust if the freedom of the Soviet Jews were to be at the

(Mr. Richardson, United Kingdom)

expense of the rights, the homes and the land of the people of the occupied territories.

The settling of Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union in the occupied territories is not only illegal: it is also politically misguided because it threatens the Middle East peace process. My Government condemns the reported terrorist threats against airlines transporting Jewish emigrés from the Soviet Union to Israel. But the prospect of these emigrés' settling in the occupied territories is an understandable source of concern to the Arab world, especially the Palestinians and Jordanians, and we share their concern. Let us not forget that the past 18 months have seen some positive developments in the Middle East. The decisions of the PLO leadership in late 1988 to accept Security Council resolutions 242 (1967) and 338 (1972), to recognize Israel's right to exist and to renounce terrorism have given fresh impetus to the search for peace in the region. We have welcomed the establishment of a dialogue between the United States and the PLO. The proposals for elections in the occupied territories and an Israel-Palestinian dialogue offer a realistic basis for the urgent task of taking the peace process forward. We hope that the coalition negotiations in Israel will shortly produce an Israeli Government that is able and willing to contribute to this process by entering into a dialogue with a credible and genuinely representative Palestinian delegation. Such a step will have our full support. It would be a grave mistake on Israel's part if the prospects for such a dialogue were to be impaired by the settling of further Jewish immigrants in those territories, including East Jerusalem, whose status remains to be determined by negotiation.

In the past two months the 12 members of the European Community have twice issued statements calling on the Israeli Government not to jeopardize the prospects of bringing peace to the Middle East by either allowing or encouraging Jewish immigrants to settle in the occupied territories. I reiterate that call today.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the United Kingdom for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Algeria. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. BENDJAMA (Algeria) (interpretation from French): In conveying to you, Sir, the warm and fraternal congratulations of the Algerian delegation, I should like to express my great satisfaction at seeing you, the representative of Democratic Yemen, presiding over the proceedings of the Security Council on a question so crucial for the Arab nation. Your wide and well-known diplomatic experience and distinguished professional qualifications are an earnest of the success of the Council's work under your enlightened guidance.

I should also like to pay a tribute to Ambassador Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba for the admirable way in which he presided over the Council last month.

Less than five months ago the Security Council was called upon - for the eighth time in two years - to deal with one of the most reprehensible aspects of the Israeli practices in the occupied Arab territories. There is no need to say that it concerned Beit Sahur, a Palestinian area of 12,000 inhabitants that had been besieged, starved, occupied and pillaged by the armed forces of the occupying Power. At that time the brutality of the repression and the disproportionate means employed to subjugate the village population, to humiliate them and to force them to pay tribute to the occupier, provoked deep feelings and led to legitimate condemnation by the whole international community. Is the fate of the inhabitants of Beit Sahur not a perfect illustration of the tragedy being experienced by the Palestinian people, which has been suffering from ruthless repression for more than four decades? The Palestinians have been spared nothing - harassments, daily persecution, arbitrary arrests, administrative internment, the dynamiting of their homes and, finally, deportation and banishment.

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

Indeed, the rationale of Israel's occupation has always been aimed at forcing the Palestinian people into despair and exile in order gradually to clear certain areas of the occupied territories of their legitimate inhabitants and to establish new settlement colonies in them. It is precisely to such settlements that they are now systematically attempting to direct Jewish immigrants, particularly those from the Soviet Union, who are being encouraged to settle in those plundered territories with the help of religious propaganda and lavish subsidies.

It is this second aspect of Israel's practices that we are discussing today. We are confronted with the massive and organized transfer of Jewish immigrants from the Soviet Union and their deliberately encouraged settlement in the occupied Arab territories. Such a phenomenon, with its undeniably tragic implications for the future of the Palestinian people, demands that we consider its various aspects in the light of the political, moral and legal standards that have brought us together here.

Is there any need for me to emphasize, first, that the individual right to emigrate, in absolute terms, is not in question here today? The recognition of that right, enshrined in article 13 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, is one of mankind's precious assets, and there has been nothing but praise for the recent lifting by the authorities of certain countries, and particularly by the Soviet Union, of restrictive measures governing the emigration of their nationals to other countries.

What we are considering here is the continual and organized flow of Soviet Jewish immigrants to Israel and the oft-stated intention of the Israeli authorities to promote the settlement of a large number of them in the occupied Arab territories. Need I delve into the "why's" and "wherefore's" of that phenomenon, which so seriously affects the vital interests of the Arab Palestinian people and further complicates the situation in that troubled region?

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

As we have always known, and as Ambassador Belonogov of the Soviet Union reaffirmed in his statement opening the debate, only a tiny minority of Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union really want to go to Israel to settle. They are forced to do so today only because their traditional destination of choice has practically been made inaccessible to them because of restrictions imposed since last summer by the United States on the granting of residence visas. They are also limited by the nature of the travel documents - simple laissez-passer which can be used only once - that they are given on leaving Soviet territory, which make it difficult for them to be sure they can find another country to receive them or that they can return to their country of origin.

Whatever the justifications given by the States concerned, the combined effect of these restrictions is directly to contribute to the forced channelling of Jewish emigrants from the Soviet Union to Israel. Once there, without resources, without papers, strangers in a strange land, they are veritable hostages as well as easy prey for the many Zionist organizations which try to move them directly into the occupied Arab territories.

Those, briefly, are the elements of this new tragedy threatening the Arab people of Palestine. It will be agreed that even taken together they have only a very remote connection with the universally acknowledged right of every human being to live in the country of his choice. Even if there were a more direct connection, would it be conceivable to grant rights to one to the detriment of the fundamental rights of another?

Would it not be profoundly unjust to grant to Soviet Jewish citizens of Moscow, Kharkov or Odessa, who have no links with the land of Palestine, the right to settle there, while more than a million Palestinians have already been forced into exile, their sacred right to return to the land of their ancestors being denied by an arrogant occupying Power?

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

If there is an irrefutable right to resettlement, that right belongs to the tens of thousands of Palestinians still languishing under canvas, regarded as refugees in their own country, who continue to suffer daily the horrors of a ruthless oppression whose purpose is ultimately to leave them no other choice but the humiliation of subjugation or the pain of exile.

If there are rights that should be defended as a matter of priority, they are the rights of the Palestinians of the occupied territories, whose fundamental freedoms are regularly flouted and whose heroic intifadah, now in its third year, illustrates their fierce determination to resist the Israeli annexationist ambitions and to see prevail their inalienable right to build their own State on their own land, finally liberated.

We cannot dissociate the question of the mass emigration of Soviet Jews from the official Israeli policy of settlement and the strengthening of settlements in the occupied Arab territories. Together with the establishment of a ruthless juridical, fiscal, administrative and police structure aimed at impoverishing, dismembering and ultimately expropriating the land that legitimately belongs to the Palestinians, the Israeli administration gives every possible encouragement and facility for the settlement of Jewish settlers. The facts are well known and well documented. Since 1967 more than 200 settlements have been established in the occupied territories and more than 200,000 Jewish settlers are already there.

The Arab part of Al-Quds, whose suburbs, it is hardly necessary to recall, cover almost a third of the occupied West Bank, is today the scene of the largest land programme in Israel. Only recently, when the Security Council had already been called upon to take stock of the dangers created by the settlement of Soviet Jewish immigrants in the occupied territories, the Israeli Government had the audacity to announce that work had begun on 4,000 new housing units in occupied

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

Al-Quds, in the allocation of which the new arrivals would be given priority. Such practices are part of a constant policy of the Zionist régime, pursued in flagrant violation of the provisions of the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949 relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Times of War, the applicability of which to occupied territories has regularly been reaffirmed by the international community.

Such practices also contravene decisions of the Security Council, particularly its resolution 465 (1980), unanimously adopted on 1 March 1980, in which the members of the Council stated that they regarded as illegal all the measures taken by Israel to alter the physical character, demographic composition and institutional structure of the occupied territories.

Finally, those practices expose, if that were necessary, the determined expansionist ambitions of Israel, which has no hesitation in flouting the cardinal rules of international law and defying the international community by proclaiming the annexation of the Arab part of Al-Quds and the Syrian territory of the Golan, and which is preparing for the same action in certain parts of southern Lebanon.

This new and painful blow to the Palestinian people is a total anachronism in the new climate in international relations, which is marked by the easing of tensions and the gradual reduction of conflicts. Only the Middle East conflict remains untouched by this and continues to be the most immediate source of tension threatening international peace and security.

No one can deny that the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, has already played its part in setting out on the path to peace; the bold decisions taken by the Palestine National Council in Algiers in November 1988 attest to the sincerity of its initiative in the search for a just and lasting solution to the Middle East

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

conflict. On the other hand, the recent vagaries of internal politics in Israel give an illuminating indication of the source of the intransigence and of the obstinate refusal of the Zionist leaders to engage in a process of negotiations which they themselves have done so much to limit.

Those delaying tactics strengthen our conviction that any movement towards peace in that long-suffering region can come about only in the framework of an international conference convened under United Nations auspices, a conference in which there would participate, with the five permanent members of the Security Council, all the parties to the conflict, including the PLO, the sole, legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, on an equal footing. We share that conviction with almost all the members of the international community, which have regularly called upon the Security Council, and particularly its permanent members, resolutely to engage in the preparatory process for the convening of such a conference.

My delegation ventures to believe that the Council can achieve unanimity in taking stock of the serious danger presented by Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories and that it will reaffirm their illegal nature, declared in resolution 465 (1980). It should once again reiterate the applicability of the fourth Geneva Convention of 1949 to the occupied Arab territories and call upon the occupying Power to refrain from any policy that might alter their physical integrity or demographic composition. It should also appeal to all States to refrain from providing the Israeli authorities with any financial or material assistance which might be used directly or indirectly to promote the establishment or strengthening of settlements in the occupied territories. It should also decide on effective measures to ensure adequate international protection for the Palestinian people.

(Mr. Bendjama, Algeria)

The unanimous adoption of these conservative measures is the very least the United Nations could do, since, as we would remind members, it shares responsibility for the plight of the Palestinian people. Failure to adopt them would mean encouraging the policy of annexation and would be an incentive for intransigence.

We venture to hope that the Security Council will display the necessary determination in the exercise of its responsibilities and finally do justice to the Arab people of Palestine.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Algeria for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Iraq. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. AL-ANBARI (Iraq) (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to congratulate you, Sir, on your election to the presidency of the Council for this month and to commend you on the competent way in which you have been directing the Council's meetings and the consultations with the parties concerned in connection with the items before the Council this month.

I also wish to congratulate your predecessor, His Excellency Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba, on the excellent manner in which he conducted the Council's proceedings last month.

The Security Council has for more than 40 years been considering the problems of the Middle East and adopting resolutions in that regard. But it has perhaps never met to deal with a problem such as that before us today: the collective, systematic emigration of Jews towards the occupied Arab territories and Jerusalem.

The problem has two aspects. The first is the displacement of Israelis into the occupied territories, and the other is the prevention of those who have left those territories from returning, which means the replacement of one people by another.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

This policy of replacing one people by another is a grave development, a colonial precedent in this twentieth century, the century that has witnessed decolonization and recognition of the right of peoples to self-determination.

Even when colonization was considered a legitimate act, the colonizing countries and the waves of immigrants entering colonized territories settled in uninhabited areas or used the pretext that the inhabitants were not civilized. In an effort to justify colonial territorial policy, we have been told that it accords with the Covenant on human rights, which gives all individuals the right to emigrate from any country. However, the Covenant does not recognize any right of communities to leave their country collectively and settle on the land of another people - in this case, the Palestinian people - thus preventing that people from returning, which is in violation of resolutions of the General Assembly.

The right to emigration does not presuppose any right to acquire the territory of others, to settle in the territory of others, to exploit their resources by force or to use illegal means such as those practised by the Israeli occupying authorities or bands of Israeli extremists against the Arabs in the occupied territories.

In other words, emigration becomes a crime when it is exercised with explicit or tacit premeditation to displace the Palestinian people from the occupied territories and to force that people to leave its land, failing which it would be exposed to all sorts of arbitrary inhumane treatment and dangers.

The world has entered a new era, a historic era marked by rapprochement between the two great Powers. More emphasis is being placed on the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts and on respect for international instruments and the rule of law in international relations, as well as the protection of human rights and different national régimes. As a result of this evolution, understanding

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

has been extended even to the Security Council, thus enhancing its effectiveness in the taking of categorical decisions that promote the settlement of international problems in accordance with the United Nations Charter, international instruments and the norms of international law. This evolution should also allow the Council to adopt the necessary measures and provisions to ensure the implementation of its resolutions and the attainment of those resolutions' objectives.

Of course, we welcome all of this change and are optimistic in this respect. But we must recall here the situation that prevailed in the recent past, which was characterized by the cold war and the policy of confrontation in international relations, which thwarted the work of the Security Council or brought it to an impasse.

In the past decades and throughout the cold war, Israel has pursued a systematic policy based on modifying the de facto situation and establishing a fait accompli. Israel has benefited from the circumstances of the cold war and used them to see to it that the Council is unable to implement its resolutions and decisions aimed at ensuring the rights of the Palestinian people and respect for international law.

Israel has thus practised a policy of horizontal regional expansion by annexing Palestinian territories, by acquiring them by force, and by attempting to control water sources in the region and to deprive the Palestinian people of freely going about its daily activities - all this in violation of the Covenant on human rights and of its obligations under the Fourth Geneva Convention and other relevant international instruments.

Now that we have reached a new stage in international détente, now that the Council's ability to reach a minimum level of mutual understanding has been strengthened, and now that the Palestine Liberation Organization is working towards a peaceful solution and is prepared to co-operate with all international efforts

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

having that aim, we see Israel resorting to intensive demographic expansion in the framework of a global campaign at the expense of the rights of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and Jerusalem. Israel is trying to put pressure on other States to encourage the emigration of Jews to Israel. It is also violating human rights in the occupied territories, and is perpetuating its violations of the Fourth Geneva Convention and the resolutions of the Security Council, especially its resolution 465 (1980), which explicitly states the illegality of the settlement policy, including in Jerusalem.

Israel is thus attempting to thwart international efforts to find a peaceful and fair solution to the problem of Palestine. It is also attempting to create Greater Israel at the expense of the rights of the Palestinian people and other Arab peoples, and it is doing so in such a way as to threaten the security of the Arab nation. That would lead to an international and regional disaster.

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

When any State pursues a policy that runs counter to the spirit and essence of international détente and the peaceful settlement of regional conflicts, and a policy contrary to the respect for human rights and the obligations contained in international instruments, that State is in violation of the law. It must therefore be prohibited from persisting in such a policy, lest we witness another round of the cold war and racial and religious regional conflicts, endangering peace and security in the Middle East and perhaps throughout the world.

I should like now to refer to the Commission established by the Security Council in its resolution 446 (1979). That Commission was entrusted with examining the question of Jewish settlements in the occupied Arab territories, including Jerusalem. In its third report, the Commission affirmed that the Israeli Government was implementing a large-scale policy of establishing settlements in the occupied territories. The report linked the establishment of settlements to the expulsion of Palestinians from the occupied territories. It also confirmed that there was a connection between the establishment of those settlements and the expulsion of the Arab population.

The Security Council adopted resolution 465 (1980), which I have already mentioned, on the basis of the report of the aforementioned Commission. In that resolution the Council affirmed the illegality of the Israeli settlements, declaring that the Israeli policy of establishing settlements in the occupied Arab territories was in contravention of the Fourth Geneva Convention, and that it jeopardized the prospects for a just and lasting peace in the Middle East.

The Israeli authorities have been defying that resolution, which was adopted unanimously by the Security Council, the supreme international body. Given the international crime being perpetrated, the least the Security Council can do is to take measures to ensure the implementation of resolution 465 (1980), since that resolution is binding upon all Members of the United Nations, especially

(Mr. Al-Anbari, Iraq)

the permanent members of the Security Council. Respect for the principles espoused by the Security Council must not depend on electoral policy or internal changes among the permanent members of the Council. They are international commitments which those States above all must respect.

Indeed, the Security Council must ensure respect not only for the rights of the Palestinian people - including human rights and self-determination - but also for the Council's own resolutions. The strengthening of the principles of international harmony that we have witnessed recently is equally important. That is why my Government considers that the Security Council and the members of the international community must take broader measures than those contained in the resolution to which I referred.

We are witnessing today an international crime of a new type, which must be halted. To that end, a resolution must be adopted that covers the following elements:

Measures must be taken to ensure the full implementation of Security Council resolution 465 (1980) and the Israeli authorities' compliance with its provisions. The new Jewish settlement policy is undermining peaceful trends in the international arena and withholding the right of Palestinians to return to their territory, which they were forced to leave by the activities of the Israeli authorities and Israeli extremist bands, contrary to the fourth Geneva Convention and the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. Member States - especially those that give assistance to Israel or that close their eyes to the aid given by Jewish organizations in those States - must be called upon to abandon the practice of settling Jews in the occupied Arab territories and of contributing funds for the purpose. Member States from which Jews emigrate must, for their part, be called upon to promote an end to that policy. An international organ must also be established to oversee the implementation of those measures.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Iraq for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Kuwait. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. ABULHASAN (Kuwait) (interpretation from Arabic): It is a great pleasure for my delegation to see a dear Arab brother from Democratic Yemen, a dear and sisterly country, in the presidency of the Council this month. We know you, Sir, as do the corridors of the United Nations, as a seasoned, distinguished diplomat. Your experience and leadership have proved useful in bringing the deliberations of the Council to fruition.

I should also like to avail myself of this opportunity to express our thanks and appreciation to our predecessor, Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada, the Permanent Representative of Cuba, for his wise leadership of the Council and management of the Council's deliberations last month.

The Security Council's debate of the question of the immigration of Soviet Jews to Israel and their settlement in occupied Arab territories brings to mind our previous experience of Jews who came from throughout the world to Palestine to oppress and displace Palestinians, confiscate their land, and establish on it a State founded on the usurpation of land, a policy of oppression, hegemony and expansion.

Since 1948, we have seen those immigrants who settled in the land of Palestine turn into an expansionist military Power at the expense of the rightful, indigenous population. The indigenous Palestinian people has been displaced from its territory through the cruelest kinds of treatment, exploitation and oppression. The Israelis have not stopped there: they threaten the security not only of neighbouring Arab countries, parts of whose territories they have occupied by brute force, but also peace and security in the Middle East and throughout the world.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

It now appears that, in spite of all the positive steps taken by Palestinian and other Arab leaders to find a just and lasting solution to the plight of the Palestinian people, the entire issue is beginning to arise once again. How like yesterday is today!

We in Kuwait consider the immigration of Soviet Jews to occupied Palestine one of the most dangerous developments surrounding the Palestinian question. It represents physical - human - support of the Zionist entity, an entity that uses every means at its disposal to replace the indigenous population of the Arab territories with foreign settlers.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Israel and its allies try to picture the emigration of Soviet Jews to the land of Palestine as a natural phenomenon based on considerations of human rights, the right of each person to choose his place of residence. But the Palestinian people has been defending its natural rights, foremost among which is its right to life, to a dignified life. Like all other peoples, the Palestinian people cannot deny that freedom to any other people. It regards human rights as sacred for itself and for other peoples. However, neither the Palestinian people nor the Arab world can agree that another people's rights can trample upon the natural right of the Palestinian people to live in its homeland. If that were to happen, it would be contrary to principles of justice and international law, above all the principle of human rights.

The emigration of Soviet Jews to the occupied land of Palestine constitutes in our opinion a very grave conspiracy. Aspects of that conspiracy have become very clear. The conspiracy is being put into effect before the eyes of the whole world, without any consideration for international laws or for Palestinian and Arab rights, or even for the implied threat to Arab national security and the stability of the Middle East.

His Royal Highness Sheikh Jaber Al-Ahmed Al-Sabah, the Emir of Kuwait, Chairman of the Fifth Summit Conference of the Organization of the Islamic Conference, emphasized the gravity of this development and warned against its continuation, in his statement on the twentieth anniversary of the establishment of the Organization of the Islamic Conference. He referred to the role played by the amendments to the United States immigration laws. Those laws established the number of persons who would be accepted as emigrants from the Soviet Union to the territory of the United States; but, finally, when all doors were opened to Soviet Jews who wished to emigrate from the Soviet Union, the United States closed its doors to them, thereby making Israel the only alternative. His Royal Highness the

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

Emir of Kuwait described this emigration as the most dangerous decision made at the end of the twentieth century by the two super-Powers against the Palestinian people. He said:

"Those who have made that decision talk about the right of a Jew to emigrate from any place and to settle wherever he wishes. But they do not talk about the right of the Arab human being in his land and the land of his ancestors. This means that they are invoking the concept of human rights only to sanction illegality. Nothing could be more illegal than this settler occupation aimed at uprooting a people from its territory and replacing it by settler strangers who had no connection with that land before. And this is being done before the eyes of the entire world."

It is ironic, indeed tragic, that all this settler colonization is taking place at a time when the Palestinian people is deprived of the right to the reunification of families. The Israeli occupation authorities have deported so many members of families - husbands, wives, sons - on the pretext that they do not have legal papers or that there are problems connected with their residence in their homeland, in the land of their ancestors. The illegality of all this and the nature of the conspiracy need no further proof.

Reports from the occupied territories indicate that the Israeli authorities have obstructed the settlement of Jews from the Soviet Union in Palestine occupied in 1948, on the pretext that there is no housing for them there, but that they are trying to settle the Soviet Jews in Israeli settlements established in the Arab territories occupied after 1967 - that is, the West Bank and the Gaza Strip.

Does the international community need to listen to statements by Shamir on Greater Israel in order to be aware of the conspiracy involved in this immigration and of the reality of the policy involved in the Zionist expansionist philosophy, which is an obsession with the ruling establishment in Israel, particularly its

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

hard-line wing? Does the international community not realize that this intensive Jewish emigration from the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe to the occupied Arab territories would only bolster this expansionist philosophy and the aggressive ideas for which Israel is only too well known, and that it would undermine all the peace efforts designed to find a just and lasting solution to the Palestine question?

We pose these questions in order to shed light on the gravity of the situation, the danger inherent in this illegal campaign regarding the Jewish immigrants - a campaign which Israel tries to base on the changes in the Soviet Union, in order only to consecrate the denial of the right of the Palestinians to their homeland and completely to eliminate any opportunity for peace in the region.

The right of the Soviet Jewish citizen to leave his homeland cannot be exercised at the expense of the right of the Palestinian Arab to live in safety in his homeland, in the land of his ancestors. Every Jew who emigrates to the occupied Arab territories becomes an armed henchman living in the land of others. If anyone has the right to enter the occupied Palestinian Arab territories and to live there, it is the deported Palestinian, the displaced Palestinian, the uprooted Palestinian. No one has the right to settle in those territories in the conditions of aggression and occupation.

From this table, Kuwait appeals to the Security Council and all the members of the international community to use all possible means to stop this illegal settlement in the occupied Arab territories of the West Bank and the Gaza Strip, to prevent these immigrants from settling there and depopulating the territories of their indigenous Arab population, so that we shall not dash the hopes for the achievement of a lasting, comprehensive peace in the Middle East.

(Mr. Abulhasan, Kuwait)

We expect the Security Council to reaffirm its determination that the Israeli settlements are illegitimate and illegal. We expect the same with respect to the Zionist entity's decision on the annexation of East Jerusalem. We expect the Council to demand that Israel adopt no measures to change the demographic composition of the occupied territories.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Kuwait for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Morocco. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. RAHHALI (Morocco) (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the Council for this opportunity to participate in this discussion of the problem of Soviet Jewish emigration to Israel, a problem to which Morocco attaches particular importance.

I wish on behalf of my delegation to express to you, Mr. President, our great satisfaction at seeing the representative of a fraternal country, the Democratic Republic of Yemen, to which we are bound by ties of brotherhood and co-operation, in the Chair for this month. We are certain that your vast experience and profound knowledge of the problems on the United Nations agenda will guarantee the success of the Council's work.

Let me also congratulate your predecessor on the wisdom with which he conducted the work of the Council last month.

The Security Council is meeting once again to examine an important question which has poisoned the atmosphere in the occupied Arab territories. It is no exaggeration to say that since 1967 the stakes have been higher in those territories than anywhere else in the Middle East because of the crucial situation in that region. The question before the Council is the flow of thousands of Soviet

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

Jewish emigrants to Israel and their settlement in the occupied Arab territories in an intensive and systematic immigration which ignores the fundamental human rights of both parties: the immigrants themselves and the Palestinians whose persons, homes and land are being threatened.

From the very beginning Morocco, at the highest level, has condemned this operation, its goals and the inhumane way in which it is being carried out. His Majesty King Hassan II stated on 1 February 1990 that

> "We do not deny the right of Soviet Jews to visit Israel and see their relatives. What we do not accept is that they should come to Israel and settle in the occupied territories without a passport enabling them to leave Israel when they decide to do so. That settlement policy flouts the human rights of the Palestinian citizens; it also ignores the human rights of the Soviet Jews themselves".

His Majesty also appealed to international public opinion and the international conscience, saying that

> "This does not violate only Arab rights. It also violates the rights of Soviet Jews, who are channelled to a certain country without papers or passports. They thus enjoy no human rights".

In article 13 (2), the Universal Declaration of Human Rights states that everyone has the right to leave any country, including his own, and to return to his country. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights reaffirms that right.

But the exercise of that right is not absolute or without its limits and regulations. It must not be allowed to deprive another individual of his rights and must not bolster a phenomenon contrary to the principles of the United Nations Charter, which reigns supreme in international law. The emigration of these

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

thousands of Soviet Jews to Israel and their settlement in the occupied territories threatens the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs, who are the victims of occupation, deprivation and exile. Moreover, the way in which Israel is carrying out this operation makes it difficult to believe its claim that it is motivated by a desire to enable the Soviet Jews to enjoy the human rights guaranteed in international instruments. In fact, this operation is but another link in the chain of the systematic settlement policy adopted by Israel. Israel's aim is to transform the demographic composition of the occupied territories with a view to entrenching its occupation, which is intended ultimately to lead to the annexation of the territory to Israel.

In a number of resolutions the Security Council has already condemned Israeli practices in the occupied territories. Those practices take different forms and constitute the means Israel uses to pursue its settlement policy.

The problem of the creation of settlements in the occupied territories is an important one, and the Council has addressed it in the course of its consideration of the situation in the territories. An indication of the importance the Council attaches to the problem is the establishment under resolution 446 (1979) of a three-member Commission. After an in-depth analysis of the situation the Commission came to a number of conclusions, of which we shall quote only one paragraph:

> "In complete disregard of United Nations resolutions and Security Council decisions, Israel is still pursuing its systematic and relentless process of colonization of the occupied territories. This is evidenced by the stated policy of constructing additional settlements in the most viable parts of the West Bank and by the expansion of others already in existence, as well as the long-term planning of still more settlements". (S/13679, para. 46)

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

In light of the Commission's report the Security Council, on 1 March 1980, unanimously adopted resolution 465 (1980), in paragraphs 5 and 6 of which the Council:

"5. Determines that all measures taken by Israel to change the physical character, demographic composition, institutional structure or status of the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem, or any part thereof have no legal validity and that Israel's policy and practices of settling parts of its population and new immigrants in those territories constitute a flagrant violation of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War and also constitute a serious obstruction to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the Middle East;

"6. Strongly deplores the continuation and persistence of Israel in pursuing those policies and practices and calls upon the Government and people of Israel to rescind those measures, to dismantle the existing settlements and in particular to cease, on an urgent basis, the establishment, construction and planning of settlements in the Arab territories occupied since 1967, including Jerusalem".

As everyone knows, the creation of settlements has continued - and, indeed, has increased - ever since, and is now even being extended into southern Lebanon.

Less than two months after the adoption of resolution 465 (1980) Israel expelled the Mayors of Hebron and Halhoul and the Sharia Judge of Hebron. In resolutions 468 (1980) and 469 (1980), adopted in May 1980, the Security Council called upon Israel to rescind that illegal measure. Israel continued to allow - and, indeed, to assist - its citizens to settle in the occupied territories, to the detriment of the legitimate inhabitants. Even harder to

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

condone is Israel's allowing such settlers to bear arms amidst unarmed Palestinians in order to sow terror and to "encourage" the Palestinian inhabitants to leave. The Council expressed its deep concern at such actions in resolution 471 (1980), adopted on 5 June 1980.

With regard to the Holy City of Jerusalem, the Security Council has on more than one occasion censured Israeli actions to alter or purport to alter the character and status of that City, regarded as holy by the three monotheist religions, with a view to its judaization. The Israeli "basic law" on the annexation of the Arab City of Jerusalem, which, in 1980, proclaimed the City as its capital, aroused the indignation of the international community and prompted the Security Council to adopt resolution 478 (1980), in which the Security Council:

"1. Censures in the strongest terms the enactment by Israel of the 'basic law' on Jerusalem and the refusal to comply with relevant Security Council resolutions;

"2. Affirms that the enactment of the 'basic law' by Israel constitutes a violation of international law and does not affect the continued application of the Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, of 12 August 1949, in the Palestinian and other Arab territories occupied since June 1967, including Jerusalem".

It is well known that over the course of the last 23 years the Council has adopted a number of resolutions. In resolution 608 (1988), for example, the Council expressed its deep regret that Israel had deported Palestinian civilians and called upon it to ensure their safe and immediate return to occupied Palestinian territories and to desist from deporting any others. In its resolutions the Council has always aimed, first, at recalling the need to respect the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

Time of War in all the occupied territories, including Jerusalem. As we all know, article 49 of that Convention prohibits the occupying Power from deporting or transfering any part of its own civilian population into the territory it occupies. We all know, too, that the Security Council has declared Israel's attempts to alter the status of the inhabitants of the occupied territories to be without legal validity and that it has called upon Israel to rescind all measures adopted to that effect, qualifying them as serious obstructions to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. The Security Council has also called upon States to refrain from assisting Israel in its settlements policy.

Despite all those decisions, Israel has continued to defy the Council and to disregard its resolutions. The Israeli leaders continue to maintain that the Fourth Geneva Convention is not applicable to the occupied Arab territories. Israel persistently continues along the course it has followed since its occupation began despite all the successive appeals by the international community, which recognizes that those territories are indeed being occupied. In that connection I should like to state that His Majesty's Government welcomes the most recent statements by members of the United States Administration, including statements by President George Bush, as well as the recent statement issued by the members of the European Community. It is regrettable, however, that the United States Senate should recently have been the only body to encourage Israel to continue its occupation of East Jerusalem.

The recent statements of certain Israeli leaders, who have referred to the realization of the dream of a Greater Israel in order to attract immigrant Jews, have exposed Israel's expansionist ambitions. Israel is attempting to divert the attention of the international community from the escalation of its campaign of

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

repression and terror against the intifadah of the Palestinian people in the occupied territories and from the immigration of Soviet Jews and their settlement in those territories. The Security Council must confront this problem with determination. Our present concern is a legitimate one, since the immigration is occurring at a time when peace efforts in the Middle East have reached a crucial stage.

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

These efforts have taken a historic turn today. This is because of the positive stands taken by the Arab States at the 1982 Fez Summit, reaffirmed at the Arab Summit Conference in Casablanca last May, and of the responsible attitude taken by the Palestinian leaders in Algiers in November 1988, reaffirmed by the President of the State of Palestine, Yasser Arafat, at the forty-third session of the General Assembly in Geneva in December the same year, which gave new impetus to this historic turn. Today there is every hope to free the Palestinian question, the core of the Middle East problem, from the impasse imposed by Israel.

The flow of new immigrants into the region will have the effect of changing all the elements of the situation and strengthen the Israeli leaders in their intransigence. They have refused all the arguments recognized by the international community for a global settlement. In his report to the Security Council presented at the end of last year the Secretary-General expressed apprehension at seeing the peace prospects disappear and called on the Council to take the opportunity to seek peace and reach a just settlement.

All that makes absolutely clear the responsibility incumbent upon the international community, particularly the Security Council. It should not let the opportunity slip. It has a fundamental role to play, for it must resist this immigration by taking every possible necessary measure to put an end to the settlements policy aimed at changing the status and character of the occupied territories. It must also provide protection for the Palestinians and compel Israel to comply with the Fourth Geneva Convention.

We sincerely hope that the Council will do everything in its power to prevent Israel from persisting in error and pursuing this occupation of Arab and Palestinian territories; it must also prevent Israel from clinging to any attitude which would impede efforts to bring about peace and security in the region and enable the Palestinian people to exercise its legitimate rights, particularly the

(Mr. Rahhali, Morocco)

right to self-determination and the creation of its own independent State on its own soil, as well as the right to return.

We reaffirm here that the holding of an international peace conference on the Middle East, with the participation of all the parties concerned, including the Palestine Liberation Organization (PLO), the sole and legitimate representative of the Palestinian people, is the appropriate framework to reach a just, comprehensive and lasting solution to the Middle East problem.

International détente, which has been welcomed by all States, has so far helped to solve many hitherto intractable problems. Consequently, it would be wrong and ironic if the Middle East problem were not to benefit from this new international climate and if efforts to eliminate the spectre of war in the region were not to be intensified because of the maintenance of tension owing to the intransigence of Israeli leaders. It would be blind not to take advantage of these radical changes and set the international community on the path towards a world of peace, security and co-operation.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Morocco for the kind words he addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. KHARRAZI (Islamic Republic of Iran): At the outset, I should like to take this opportunity to congratulate you, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council. I am delighted to see you, a distinguished diplomat from the friendly an brotherly country of the Democratic Yemen, presiding over the deliberations of the Council. I am confident that because of your skills and vast diplomatic experience you will efficiently guide the Council's deliberations on this important subject. I should also like to extend my

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

gratitude to the Permanent Representative of Cuba, and his able delegation, for a valuable and effective performance as President last month.

These meetings of the Security Council are being held at a time when the glorious uprising of the Palestinian people - the intifadah - has been going on for more than two years and the Muslim people of Palestine, in spite of all pressures and repressive practices of the occupying régime of Al-Quds, have proved, by offering dear martyrs and unique sacrifices against the aggressors, that they neither hesitate to resist nor abandon their struggle until their justified aspiration is realized and their suppressed rights are restored.

The subject now being addressed by the Security Council is of paramount importance and has various dimensions, particularly as regards its effects on strengthening the domination of the Zionist régime over the occupied Palestinian territory.

It is an undeniable fact that, throughout more than 40 years of occupation of the Islamic Land of Palestine and of history of agony and suffering of the oppressed people of Palestine, it has been the generous assistance and support of arrogant Powers, especially the United States, given to the aggressive policies and practices of the Zionist régime that have had more effect than any other factor in the continuation of aggression and the strengthening of pillars of the occupying régime of Quds.

The history of occupied Palestine clearly demonstrates that one of the well-known policies and traditional tactics of the Zionist régime in perpetuating its domination and extending its aggression in Palestine has been the absorbing of Jewish people from different parts of the world under the humanitarian pretext of their settlement in the occupied territory of Palestine.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

In the wake of the remarkable changes in East-West relations the Government of the Soviet Union's granting of permission for accelerated emigration of its Jewish people to the Islamic land of Palestine, resort by the Zionist régime to such a policy has become widespread in recent months. There is no doubt that this move is part of the futile effort by the Zionist occupiers to eradicate the Islamic uprising in Palestine.

In fact, the recent immigration of the Jewish people to the occupied territories, which is an integral part of systematic efforts by the Zionist régime to alter the Islamic nature, cultural and demographic status of the usurped land of Palestine, is a flagrant challenge to the Islamic world. Unfortunately, the silence and indifference of the international community towards these moves has made the Zionist régime's authorities more impudent, as the Prime Minister of that régime has declared shamelessly that a Greater Israel is needed for settlement of the newly arrived immigrants.

In view of the depth of the political, economic and strategic support extended by world arrogance, particularly the United States, to the Zionist régime, it is obvious that the Zionist régime has ominous and widespread schemes to strengthen its aggression and extend its domination in the region, and has accelerated the trend of implementing such schemes by taking advantage of the present atmosphere in international relations and the subsequent changes in East-West relations.

It is incumbent upon the international community, particularly the Security Council, to adopt serious and necessary measures in order to put an end to such moves and prevent the Zionist régime from continuing its aggression in the occupied Palestinian territories.

(Mr. Kharrazi, Islamic Republic of Iran)

It is regrettable that the United States has so far, by resorting to veto power, obstructed the adoption of any decision and measure by the Security Council against the expansionist policies of the Zionist régime and has prevented the Security Council fulfilling the duties entrusted to it by the United Nations Charter.

The Islamic Republic of Iran, while condemning the illegal practices of the Zionist régime in the settlement of Jewish immigrants in occupied Palestine, deplores any move conducive to the implementation of such a policy and once again reaffirms that the only way to solve the old problems of Palestine and establish justice in the Middle East is to establish an independent Palestinian State in the entire land of Palestine.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran for his kind words addressed to me.

The next speaker is the representative of Afghanistan. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

Mr. NOOR (Afghanistan): May I at the outset, Sir, express to you my best congratulations on your assumption of the presidency of the Security Council for the month of March. Your vast diplomatic skills and experience, we are confident, will outstandingly contribute to your successful stewardship of the Council's activities during this month. May I also express our appreciation to your predecessor, Ambassador Ricardo Alarcon de Quesada of Cuba, for his successful guidance of the Security Council during the month of February.

The recent Zionist drive to accelerate the pace of Jewish settlement in the illegally occupied Palestinian and other Arab territories, through the infusion into the area of a new wave of Jewish immigrants arriving in Israel, is yet another

(Mr. Noor, Afghanistan)

sign of the expansionist policy persistently pursued by Tel Aviv over a long period of time. This policy, condemned time and again by the international community, constitutes the root cause of the complicated situation of instability, conflict and war in the Middle East. It has constantly posed a grave danger to international peace and security in this part of the world, and has brought nothing but bloodshed and enormous human suffering to the peoples of the region.

The recent intensification of this expansionist policy is all the more unsettling because it takes place at a time, and in the face, of recent promising steps towards the restoration of a just and durable peace in the Middle East through the solution of the question of Palestine, which lies at its core. It is, in fact, a total and arrogant defiance of the international consensus on the need for the restoration of the full rights of the Palestinian people, including the right to have its own State on its own territory. The Israeli actions being deliberated upon in the Council are nothing but an attempt further to complicate the restoration of this Palestinian right, without which, we all know, no durable resolution of the Arab-Israeli conflict is conceivable.

What is more, this new surge in the Israeli expansionist policy also comes in the wake of a heroic intifadah of the Palestinian people, which has clearly demonstrated its will to get back from the aggressor what rightly and legitimately belongs to it: its freedom, its independence and its territory. While the international community rightly expects Israel to put an end to its brutal suppression of the Palestinian people and join the efforts to bring peace to the peoples of the Middle East, Tel Aviv's reply comes in the form of new designs for perpetuating its usurpation of Palestinian and other Arab territories. This Israel must not be allowed to do.

(Mr. Noor, Afghanistan)

We also deplore the fact that while the leadership of the State of Palesti has taken so many important steps towards an honourable solution of the Arab-Israeli conflict, Zionism not only persists in its illegal occupation of t Palestinians' land and denial of their rights, but also comes out with a new demonstration of its expansionist designs. Israel's persistent efforts to chan the demographic composition of these lands through continued Jewish settlements runs counter not only to peace efforts but also to the 1949 Geneva Convention relative to the Protection of Civilian Persons in Time of War, which clearly precludes such attempts.

(Mr. Noor, Afghanistan)

For all these reasons, it is our earnest hope that by taking resolute action against this illegal Israeli move the Security Council will not fail to send a most clear signal to Israel that the international community cannot and does not tolerate Israeli expansionist designs and its constant attempts to block efforts for the restoration of peace in the Middle East. We also believe that such intransigent actions on the part of Israel indicate that there is no room for postponing the convening of an international conference towards finding a just and durable peace in the Middle East with the participation, on an equal footing, of all the sides concerned, including Palestine. The time for such a conference has clearly come.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I thank the representative of Afghanistan for his kind words addressed to me.

There are no further speakers for this meeting. The date and time of the next meeting of the Council to continue its consideration of the item on its agenda will be communicated to members by the Secretariat.

The meeting rose at 12.50 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2916
29 March 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SIXTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Thursday, 29 March 1990, at 4 p.m.

President:	Mr. AL-ASHTAL	(Democratic Yemen)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. LI Luye
	Colombia	Mr. PEÑALOSA
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Ethiopia	Mr. GOSHU
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60366/A 7156V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

THE SITUATION BETWEEN IRAN AND IRAQ

REPORT OF THE SECRETARY-GENERAL ON THE UNITED NATIONS IRAN-IRAQ MILITARY OBSERVER GROUP (S/21200)

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): I should like to inform the Security Council that I have received letters from the representatives of the Islamic Republic of Iran and Iraq in which they request to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the Council's agenda. In conformity with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite those representatives to participate in the discussion without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Kadrat (Iraq) took places at the Council table.

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

Members of the Council have before them the report of the Secretary-General (S/21200) on the United Nations Iran-Iraq Military Observer Group (UNIIMOG) for the period 23 September 1989 to 22 March 1990.

Members of the Council have before them also a draft resolution, in document S/21217, which has been prepared in the course of the Council's consultations.

(The President)

It is my understanding that the Council is ready to proceed to the vote on that draft resolution. If I hear no objection, I shall put it to the vote now.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

A vote was taken by show of hands.

In favour: Canada, China, Colombia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Malaysia, Romania, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Zaire

The PRESIDENT (interpretation from Arabic): There were 15 votes in favour of the draft resolution. It has therefore been adopted unanimously as resolution 651 (1990).

The Security Council has thus concluded the present stage of its consideration of the item on its agenda.

The meeting rose at 4.10 p.m.

UNITED NATIONS

S

Security Council

PROVISIONAL

S/PV.2917
17 April 1990

ENGLISH

PROVISIONAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE TWO THOUSAND NINE HUNDRED AND SEVENTEENTH MEETING

Held at Headquarters, New York,
on Tuesday, 17 April 1990, at 10.30 a.m.

President:	Mr. TADESSE	(Ethiopia)
Members:	Canada	Mr. FORTIER
	China	Mr. YU Mengjia
	Colombia	Mrs. CASTANO
	Côte d'Ivoire	Mr. ESSY
	Cuba	Mr. ALARCON de QUESADA
	Democratic Yemen	Mr. AL-ASHTAL
	Finland	Mr. TORNUDD
	France	Mr. BLANC
	Malaysia	Mr. HASMY
	Romania	Mr. MUNTEANU
	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	Mr. BELONOGOV
	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Mr. RICHARDSON
	United States of America	Mr. PICKERING
	Zaire	Mr. BAGBENI ADEITO NZENGEYA

This record contains the original text of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches in the other languages. The final text will be printed in the Official Records of the Security Council.

Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned, within one week, to the Chief, Official Records Editing Section, Department of Conference Services, room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

90-60372/A 7191V (E)

The meeting was called to order at 10.50 a.m.

EXPRESSION OF THANKS TO THE RETIRING PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT: As this is the first meeting of the Security Council for the month of April, I should like to take this opportunity to pay tribute, on behalf of the Council, to His Excellency Mr. Abdalla Saleh Al-Ashtal, Permanent Representative of Democratic Yemen to the United Nations, for his remarkable service as President of the Security Council for the month of March 1990. I am sure I speak for all members of the Security Council in expressing deep appreciation to Ambassador Al-Ashtal for the great diplomatic skill and unfailing courtesy with which he conducted the Council's business last month.

ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The agenda was adopted.

ADMISSION OF NEW MEMBERS

LETTER DATED 6 APRIL 1990 FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF NAMIBIA ADDRESSED TO THE SECRETARY-GENERAL (S/21241)

The PRESIDENT: The Security Council will now begin its consideration of the item on its agenda.

In a letter dated 6 April 1990 addressed to the Secretary-General, the President of the Republic of Namibia submitted the application of his country for membership in the United Nations. That letter has been circulated in document S/21241. Under the provisions of rule 59 of the provisional rules of procedure of the Security Council, unless the Council decides otherwise applications for membership shall be referred by the President of the Council to the Committee on the Admission of New Members. Accordingly, unless I hear a proposal to the contrary, I shall refer the application of the Republic of Namibia to the Committee on the Admission of New Members for examination and report. The

(The President)

last sentence of rule 59 provides that the Committee shall report its conclusions to the Council not less than 14 days in advance of a special session of the General Assembly. As the eighteenth special session of the General Assembly will commence on 23 April, I propose that the Council agree to waive the time-limit on this occasion.

I take it that the Council agrees to follow the procedure I have just outlined.

There being no objection, it is so decided.

I would suggest that the members of the Committee on the Admission of New Members meet immediately following the adjournment of this meeting in order to examine the application of the Republic of Namibia and prepare the Committee's report to the Council.

As I hear no objection, it is so decided.

Accordingly, the Committee will meet in 10 minutes in Conference Room 5.

I would further request the Committee to prepare its report for the consideration of the Security Council at a meeting to be held at 3.30 p.m. today.

The meeting rose at 10.55 a.m.